Devotion may be called intentness on the reality of the Self.
—*Crest-Jewel of Wisdom*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 54 SEPTEMBER, 1966 NUMBER 11

THE POLARITIES OF HUMAN LIFE

The Self-Being pierced the opening outwards; hence one looks outward, not within himself. A wise man looks towards the Self with reverted sight, seeking deathlessness.
—*Katha Upanishad*

THE pure abstractions of philosophic metaphysics perform an indispensable service for the mind, which has deep need to order its thoughts according to primary categories. Here, in the Upanishad, the categories are two, relating to the direction of attention. These verses make a man continually question the mood of his life. It is a matter of knowing, as well as one can, the quality of that upon which the heart is set.

By means of such counsels the disciple begins to gain control of what has been called his "lifetime meditation," and may come to identify the persisting thread of concentration which gives focus to his accumulating karmic destiny. He has, then, a guide to thought; but what of action? More investigation is needed to bring the light of philosophy to bear on the meaning and structure of any "present," which often can be read in a variety of ways.

A man's life is always surrounded by a hard crust of circumstances, and these he shares, more or less, with other men. He has also a share in the general interpretation of "reality" common in his place and time. This always includes a wide spectrum of interest and concern, and is at the same time both a means of bondage *to* the present and access to what the men of that present account "progress" and "growth." This spectrum is the sphere of the psychic

and intellectual life of mankind, during the cycle which it represents. It supplies the materials of dialogue, argument, and controversy. The great question is, how can these materials be used for the common enlightenment? How can individuals, groups, societies, nations, and races be helped to convert the stuff of confinement into the paving of avenues of evolution? What kind of "reverted sight" will have the greatest meaning to people caught up in the dreams and preoccupations of a particular moment of history, as indeed, must be all those whose embodiment in matter at that moment declares their general position—their illusion/truth ratio—on the great scale of life?

Fortunately, we do not have to answer this question, save in the humblest of its forms. For reply to so far-reaching an inquiry, we have the entire body of the work of H.P.B., who was, we might say, a Montessori of the hidden potentialities of yearning but captive souls. Students of Theosophy study the writings of H. P. Blavatsky because, whatever their limitations, they have come to believe with all their hearts that there is no better way to learn how to help and teach others. They will not presume to be "curriculum supervisors" in the school of life. They will not imagine they can "improve" on the work of educators who have before them a perspective covering centuries and on a millennia of such efforts to help on the human race. An understanding of both great and small evolutionary cycles is pervasive throughout the Theosophical literature, and it is this understanding for which the individual student may hope to obtain some few intuitive parallels, while knowing well he cannot now encompass the horizons open and clear to his teachers.

In time, however, he may develop horizons of his own. For he is a thinker, and for thinking or Manasic beings, the life of the mind is always in terms of an *organism* of thought. He cannot only repeat in the same words what he has heard. He may do this at the beginning, but what he truly knows is only what he is able to make his own—a living element in his organism of thought. Least of all, however, will this give him "authority." Only a little understanding of philosophy will cause a man to eschew any resemblance to conventional authority, just as it will make him indifferent to the "confinement" aspect—the dead, karmic deposit—of the external life of the times. He is interested only in increasing the vigor of the principles of growth.

Where in the mind of the child, do these principles reside? Where,

in the life of a man? He does not know, he cannot tell. Yet the same discoveries of meaning which have made his own mind take fire may be of value to others. His own self-understanding remains the best key of all. The Doctrine of the Heart is not in words. It is not held in sacred formulas. The Doctrine of the Heart always flows from the heart's sense of the need and egoic longings of others. Its language has always an infusion of the subtle speech of souls.

The Buddhist maxim, "Thus have I heard," is not alone an expression of the disciple's modesty and lack of self-assertion. It is above all a declaration of the impersonality of truth, the universality of principle. The honor given to H.P.B. is recognition of her capacity to disclose the ruling principles of life and nature as they may be found, although less easily, in all great systems of religion and philosophy. They are "owned" by no one.

We work in a vast laboratory of evolution, in an endless exhibition of the phenomena of life. The manual for workers, the catalogue of the displays, bears the imprint of the Teachers, yet each one of us has his focus of attention and his own work bench. His task is to do his work in harmony with all the rest. In time he will find a larger work to do.

Our principles are not of the times, but of all times. This is a great advantage, the supreme aid in individual development, yet there are difficulties to be faced. The path of action is still obscure, for who with high confidence will point to the best possible application of timeless principles in an age made so helpless by the preoccupations of the time? In particular, we cannot tell, or we find it impossible to be in any sense sure. Such certainty belongs only to the adepts. The use of the Spiritualist movement to pry open the mind of the nineteenth century to the transcendental possibilities in man was a decision of the adepts. H.P.B. ignored the centers of learning, the institutions of science and religion, and went to the people with her teaching of man's spiritual destiny.

Such work, we may think, changes with times and human needs. Paracelsus was a physician, Mesmer a great psychologist, Paine a patriot of all mankind. And such beings use the vocabulary they have learned to perfection during a long egoic past. Their speech was the sure enunciation of first-hand experience. Their light was the light from another world, not generated by calculating deductions and manipulations of the light from this. It is the speech of philosophy applied.

They were all wise men who looked toward the Self in a way that could be understood by the best of their contemporaries. They knew the difference between the husks of form, the rind of circumstance, and egotic stirrings from within. Yet this is an understanding which, on his own scale, each one can try to practice in his own place. His knowledge will grow from no other cause.

MAN'S ASCENDING SEARCH

Man doth seek a triple perfection: first a sensual, consisting in those things which very life itself requireth either as necessary supplements, or as beauties and ornaments thereof; then an intellectual, consisting in those things which none underneath man is either capable of or acquainted with; lastly a spiritual and divine, consisting in those things whereunto we tend by supernatural means here, but cannot attain unto them. They that make the first of these three the scope of their whole life have no god but only their belly, to be earthly minded men. Unto the second they bend themselves, who seek especially to excel in all such knowledge and virtue as doth most commend men. To this branch belongeth the law of moral and civil perfection. That there is somewhat higher than either of these two, no other proof doth need than the very process of man's desire, which being natural should be frustrate, if there were not some farther thing wherein it might rest at the length contented, which in the former it cannot do. For man doth not seem to rest satisfied, either with fruition of that wherewith his life is preserved, or with performance of such actions as advance him most deservedly in estimation; but doth further covet, yea oftentimes manifestly pursue with great sedulity and earnestness, that which cannot stand him in any stead for vital use; that which exceedeth the reach of sense; yea somewhat above capacity of reason, somewhat divine and heavenly, which with hidden exultation it rather surmiseth than conceiveth; somewhat it seeketh, and what that is directly it knoweth not, yet very intentive desire thereof doth so incite it, that all other known delights and pleasures are laid aside, they give place to the search of this but only suspected desire.

—RICHARD HOOKER

MAN

Man, being an emanation from the Unknown, yet ever present and infinite Divine Essence, his body and everything else is impermanent—hence an illusion; Spirit alone in him being the one enduring substance and even that losing its separate individuality at the moment of its complete re-union with the Universal Spirit.

—*The Key to Theosophy*

WHAT is man, in reality? Threefold is his nature: (1) MAN as spirit, impersonal, unconditioned, is the Divine Principle, the root-essence of all being; (2) Man as soul is the self-conscious Intelligence that incarnates from life to life for the salvation of (3) man as the mortal, personal nature. These are the Three-in-One; and the whole aim of existence is that Man shall manifest that Unity here on this earthly plane. To take a partial analogy: Spirit is like music, ever perfect on its own abstract plane, whether played well or badly or left unplayed; soul is like the conductor whose task is to train and direct the heterogeneous players of the orchestra, to so weld them into a unity that the music may be faithfully expressed. The players must merge their separate wills with that of the conductor. Thus in life, the Sovereign Lord cannot rule unless the consciousness is detached from the "orchestra" of personality, instincts and material thoughts, and placed upon Him. That Soul is Krishna, the sustainer of Arjuna in his despair, his own higher nature.

"Man," in its highest sense, means a purely spiritual self-conscious entity, which is just so much abracadabra to the ordinary human being. For "Man" to him means the human being. Yet one who studies Theosophical writings will see that the human being is *not* the Man.

What is a human being? It is a soul; that is, it is an evolving life which has reached equilibrium between spirit and matter—matter representing complete unconsciousness and spirit representing complete consciousness. A human being is an evolving life or a soul or mind which has reached an equilibrium between the highest and the lowest states. What does it mean to reach equilibrium? It means

that one is aware that there are opposed conditions in life, and, because of this awareness, is able to choose—whether wisely or not—between the two states.

But *man* has a *transcendent* meaning. It is clear, then, that the evolving soul starts as an entity or an individual in the state of complete and utter individual unconsciousness, as a "drop," so to say, of the Monadic essence. As H. P. Blavatsky explains in *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 175):

> The MONAD emerges from its state of spiritual and intellectual unconsciousness; and, skipping the first two planes—too near the ABSOLUTE to permit of any correlation with anything on a lower plane—it gets direct into the plane of Mentality. But there is no plane in the whole universe with a wider margin, or a wider field of action in its almost endless gradations of perceptive and apperceptive qualities, than this plane, which has in its turn an appropriate smaller plane for every "form," from the "mineral" monad up to the time when that monad blossoms forth by evolution into the DIVINE MONAD. But all the time it is still one and the same Monad, differing only in its incarnations, throughout its ever succeeding cycles of partial or total obscuration of spirit, or the partial or total obscuration of matter—two polar antitheses—as it ascends into the realms of mental spirituality, or descends into the depths of materiality.

This evolving soul has no consciousness of its own. It is the "purely spiritual Buddhi (divine Soul)" of the Third Fundamental. The soul passes through three elementary or elemental states of consciousness; that is, the soul is aroused to momentary action through the impulse or impress of other forms of life which are using it without its knowledge.

Now, this evolving life is not an "elemental"—this is only a convenient form of speech. The soul passes *through* three elementary states, forms, conditions, but is not any of them. Then this evolving Monad—or purely spiritual Buddhi, or divine soul, or evolving individual—after passing through these three elementary states of consciousness or formation, lapses once more into complete unconsciousness, which is what entering the mineral state means. It goes to sleep; it has its Nirvana—an unconscious Nirvana, but Nirvana nonetheless.

Slowly, it is once more stirred into activity, and this same evolving essence passes through three more states of consciousness, which we name *mineral, vegetable,* and *animal.* (These are not their proper names, but they are the nearest to our comprehension.) This soul,

then, has passed through three deep-sleep stages—the elementary stages; it has passed through three dream states—what we call mineral, vegetable and animal; and finally it has waked up to the fact that there are opposites. That is, it has waked up to *external* perception, and then we have a "human being."

Who does the waking up? Who or what is it that conducts this beginning Soul through the three elemental kingdoms? Who or what urges it on through the three states of consciousness known here as the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal? It is descending spirits who represent full individual consciousness while in separative existence. Of such is Man. When the evolving life has reached the human state—that is, has become aware of contrasts—it is open to induced self-consciousness. How? Through the union of the psychic nature of the descending intelligence of man with the psychic nature of the evolving soul. And then, just as one drop of water can coalesce with another drop, you do not have two souls in one body, but one soul. The evolving soul is absorbed in the consciousness of the spiritual man, and the spiritual man's self-consciousness is reflected in the human being. From this point of human consciousness, there begins another cycle—the purely intellectual and spiritual cycle of man, leading in time to the perfection of his development—as a Mahatma; and in that cycle there are seven stages. As Mr. Judge sketches it in "Sheaths of the Soul":

> Man is a Soul, and *as such* stands among *material things*. This soul is not only on its way upward for itself, but is compelled at the same time to draw up, refine, purge and perfect the gross matter—so-called—in which it is compelled to live. For though we call the less fine stages of *substance* by the name "matter," it is however, made up of *lives* which have in them the potentiality of becoming *Souls* in the enormously distant future; and the *Soul being itself a life made up of smaller ones,* it is under the brotherly necessity of waiting in the bonds of matter long enough to give the latter the right impetus along the path of perfection.

So, to say that a man was once an animal means rather that man was once asleep, or was once in the dream-state. That is hard for us to see, because we often do not look carefully at the meanings of our terms. We confuse the being with his *form,* but he isn't his form, no matter what the form is. We confuse the being with the *state* into which he goes or from which he comes; he is never the state, no matter what the state is—the highest or the lowest. As soon as we see those two things—that evolving life is no form and

no state—then there is a chance for us to see for ourselves what evolution means.

One more thing might be added: Are we an animal now? Each man has to answer that for himself! We are certainly in an animal state of consciousness and we are certainly in an animal body, right now. But are we "animals" because of that? We are certainly in a vegetable state of consciousness and in a vegetable form right now. Yet are we vegetables? We are immersed in the mineral kingdom, right now, and our form has its mineral aspect. Does that make us minerals? When these questions are brought home to us in this way, there is some chance for us to see that H.P.B. was compelled to make use of such terms as were available, terms with which we are familiar, while she endeavored as far as possible to put *her* meaning into them. Thus, when an adult talks to a child, he takes into account that it is a child-mind he is talking to and that the child is going to take a child's view of things, no matter how wise the adult may be.

Just so, the Teachers knew that we, being immersed in that state of consciousness that represents the union of the three elemental kingdoms, were bound to take a human viewpoint of what They had to say. But once we grasp the idea that we *are now Life,* that we *never were anything but Life,* and that man in any sense means a life which has reached a given degree of spiritual, intellectual, and physical evolution, the problem becomes clear. We understand that the teachers are only using a convenient phraseology when they say that spirit becomes a stone, the stone becomes a plant, the plant becomes an animal, the animal becomes a man, and the man becomes a god. In explanation, H.P.B. quotes A. P. Sinnett (*Key to Theosophy,* pp. 172-4):

> The human soul, once launched on the streams of evolution as a human individuality, passes through alternate periods of physical and relatively spiritual existence. It passes from the one plane, or stratum, or condition of nature to the other under the guidance of its Karmic affinities; living in incarnations the life which its Karma has pre-ordained; modifying its progress within the limitations of circumstances, and—developing fresh Karma by its use or abuse of opportunities—it returns to spiritual existence (Devachan) after each physical life,—through the intervening region of Kama-loka—for rest and refreshment and for the gradual absorption into its essence as so much cosmic progress of the life's experience gained "on earth" or during physical existence. . . . We—the souls within us—are not as it were alto-

gether adrift in the ocean of matter. We clearly retain some surviving interest or rights in the shore from which, for a time, we have floated off. The process of incarnation, therefore, is not fully described when we speak of an *alternate* existence on the physical and spiritual planes, and thus picture the soul as a complete entity slipping entirely from the one state of existence to the other. The more correct definitions of the process would probably represent incarnation as taking place on this physical plane of nature by reason of an efflux emanating from the soul. The Spiritual realm would all the while be the proper habitat of the soul, which would never entirely quit it; *and that non-materializable portion of the Soul which abides permanently on the spiritual plane may fitly,* perhaps, be spoken of as the HIGHER SELF.

Manifestly, we have not reached the highest degree of spiritual evolution, or we should never have lost our individual consciousness; we should be in Nirvana all the time, no matter where our body happens to be. Manifestly, we have not reached the highest degree of intellectual evolution; if we had, we should be able to affect matter now by will and thought, as the Mahatmas affect it. But we do know that the self-consciousness in the man of fifty is the same as that when he was twenty-five or a child of five. *That* is the man, the perceiving self-consciousness.

A MATTER OF OUTLOOK

The very best I can say to you is that, as you know, all our troubles in life arise from ourselves, no matter how much they may seem to come from the outside; we are all parts of the one great whole, and if you try to centre your mind upon that fact, and to remember that those things that seem to trouble you are really due to your own way of looking at the world and life, you will probably grow more contented in mind. It is your own mind you should watch, and not the circumstances in which you are placed. Others have been in worse circumstances than what you think surround you, and have not been disturbed as you seem to be. It must be, therefore, that it is the way you yourself look at this thing; stop looking at it, then, in that way and look at everything in a contented spirit, feeling sure that they are all more or less illusionary, and you will do better.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

YOUTH FORUM

How would a knowledge of the after-death states help a person in his present life?

A useful restatement of this question would be, "How do the after-death states correspond to aspects of our conscious, physical life?" If no direct and immediate correspondence existed, we could leave this doctrine, without fear of personal loss, to the metaphysical specialists. However, Mr. Judge suggests in an article called "Devachan" that an important connection does in fact exist:

> In everyday life many illustrations can be found of the operation upon living men of the same force which put disembodied men into Devachan. The artist, poet, musician, and day-dreamer constantly show it. When rapt in melody, composition, color arrangement, and even foolish fancy, they are in a sort of living Devachanic state wherein they often lose consciousness of time and sense impressions. Their stay in that condition depends, as we well know, on the impulses toward it which they have amassed.

Incarnation means to be trapped or fixed, much of the time, in physical, psychic, or even conceptual existence; the post-mortem states are subjective extensions of an individual's purely personal tendencies following each incarnation. Earth-bound existence is manifestly inadequate to give full expression to the range of our desires, from the grossest physical to the most utopian ideal. The after-death states provide such an opportunity. Those impulses which dominate many dimensions of our being are subjectively projected at death into the field of Kama Loka and that of Devachan. In Kama Loka are worked out those desires which were attached to physical things, while Devachan becomes the playground for mind-born desires, fancies, and high visions—for the "modifications of the mind" spoken of by Patanjali. Thus, earth-life prepares our future in Kama Loka and Devachan.

But what do these states indicate to us about our earthly existence? A great deal. They remind us, for example, of how difficult

it may be to "incarnate" fully into a situation; this is illustrated by the sense of incompleteness attending much of what we do. To compensate for this condition, men polarize their desires, wishes, and unfulfilled dreams—that is, they become specialists—fixating on one area of life in hope of achievement. Everyone has had some deep preoccupation or interest in which his thoughts and feelings "lose consciousness of time and sense impressions." What do these intervals accomplish? If the preoccupation revels in high visions or tender feelings, it gives to the post-mortem consciousness—and the living man—the psychic equivalent of rest. If it is of a Kamic nature, the psychic distraction accumulates passions and emotions during earth life for dissipation in Kama Loka after death.

We also gain a kind of negative knowledge from the post-mortem states. The psychology of these states undoubtedly has to do with our lack of confidence in the very ideas which underlie all Theosophic study; it has to do with the ability of a person to recognize that there can be no perfection, no real completion of tasks which are worthy of egoic attention.

Perhaps no better description exists of the man who has outgrown the need for Kama Loka and Devachan than that found in the *Bhagavad-Gita*. Here the "wise" man is not an intellectual giant, or a mystic adept. He is simply one who has come to rely on Karma, who seeks an understanding of himself and the world "by doing service, by strong search, by questions, and by humility." The fourth chapter of the *Gita* has this familiar description of such a man:

> He abandoneth the desire to see a reward for his actions, is free, contented, and upon nothing dependeth, and although engaged in action he really doeth nothing; he is not solicitous of results, with mind and body subdued and being above enjoyment from objects, doing with the body alone the acts of the body, he does not subject himself to rebirth. He is contented with whatever he receives fortuitously, is free from the influence of "the pairs of opposites" and from envy, the same in success and failure; even though he act he is not bound by the bonds of action. All actions of such a man who is free from self-interest, who is devoted, with heart set upon spiritual knowledge, and whose acts are sacrifices for the sake of the Supreme, are dissolved and left without effect on him.

This man is, of course, the perfected ideal of the disciple. We have here, in essence, the difference between Self and non-Self; and, for Manasic beings, the difference between *psychic* and *noëtic*

action. Since the most intense action of these two principles is in the astral light, it is understandable why Devachan and Kama Loka are both continuing cycles set up by the higher and lower aspects of the incarnated Manas. Thus H. P. Blavatsky spoke indirectly to the need for study of after-death states when she said:

> Blessed is he who has acquainted himself with the dual powers at work in the ASTRAL light; thrice blessed he who has learned to discern the *Noëtic* from the *Psychic* action of the "Double-Faced" God in him, and who knows the potency of his own Spirit—or "Soul Dynamics."

There is a great deal of discussion and doctrine pertaining to the after-death states for the human being. Are there corresponding states affecting the life in the lower kingdoms?

The after-death states are part of a distinct human cycle of evolution. They could exist in the lower kingdoms only if the animals, plants, and lower forms had self-consciousness and Will, or the ability to generate ideas. It is these powers which make Devachan a necessary condition for every human being who exercises them, but who cannot express the energy they generate. No Promethean Will is necessary to open a flower, no manasic intelligence (of a human scale) is needed by a sparrow to catch a worm; and it is difficult to imagine a forest which would grow from a self-conscious vision embodied in the trunk of every tree.

Not much is said in the teachings about such cycles-of-change in the lower kingdoms. What is said pertains mainly to the idea of "natural impulse," while the really specific descriptions of evolution begin with man and his Lemuro-Atlantean heritage.

Antecedent forms and the development of psychic individuality through evolution in the kingdoms is sketched only in the most general terms. The reason for this apparent neglect may well be that until we assimilate what is manifestly needed for our present growth, the knowledge of non-human growth-processes and cycles would be useless to us and a learned distraction.

A CHRISTIAN MINISTER ON THEOSOPHY

[In the year 1883, the Reverend C. H. A. Dall, a Christian missionary in India, wrote to the *Indian Mirror,* expressing his reactions to the teachings of Theosophy, and comparing certain Hindu and Buddhist doctrines with those of Christianity. His laudations and criticisms were later published in the *Theosophist* for November, 1883, where, as editor, H. P. Blavatsky gave Mr. Dall full credit for his fair-mindedness, adding clarification of his misconceptions concerning Nirvana, the God idea, and Theosophy generally. Passages from Mr. Dall's letter and then from H.P.B.'s reply are given below.—Eds., THEOSOPHY]

SKEPTOMAI is Greek for "I enquire." In the radical sense I am a sceptic regarding Theosophy. I do not understand it but am trying my best to find out what it is. . . . Yes: I see good in it. It is clear that Theosophy just now means freedom. It means self-trust and self-control. It means, today, courage and independence. What I fear is its narrowness, as a plan of life. Nothing is clearer than the fact that old Hinduism strikes for one good thing; and that is *worship*. It says God is all, and all is God, and nothing exists, or should exist but God. So far, so good. Hinduism and Buddhism would kill feeling, kill enquiry, kill enterprise to secure Union with God—*Nirvana,* the perfection, at once, of Hinduism, and Buddhism, means Rest; rest in the Infinite from work, from study, and from society. I do not want that self-centered rest; here or hereafter. I want rest; eternal, sacred, sure; rest in God, for ever. But not a rest that denies me association with Him and with kindred spirits, in beneficent power. I seek rest in the fellowship with the Infinite and Eternal Worker, Lover, Life-giver. I do not wish my son to lose himself in me. And I think Hinduism and Buddhism err, in bidding me lose myself in God. The patriarchal Debendronath Tagore one day said to me "I like your definition of *Nirvana,* 'Lost in God'; you have it exactly." Hinduism and Buddhism, pure and simple, forbid thought; which Life and God command. . . . My fear is that Theosophy will undertake so much as to accomplish very little. "Do a little, and do it well," is a good motto. Was he a good Theosophist, who, in thought and hope, twenty centuries ago, gathered "all na-

tions," and said to religions "of the East and of the West," "I was hungry and you fed me, I was naked and you clothed me"? And when some of the nations said "how could we feed you when we never saw you?" Jesus replied, "In doing it to your own poor, *my brothers,*—You did it to me." This sounds like human brotherhood. So with other sayings of this child of Abraham, and son of David (Theosophist?) such as "call no one your father on the earth; for one is your father, even God; and ye (all men)—are brothers." And a leading pupil of his said "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good and true." "Glory, honor, and peace (*Nirvana*) to every man that worketh good." And another of his pupils said, "In every nation he that feareth God, (hath the Aryan reverence?) and does right, is accepted of God" as a true man.

If this is Theosophy, the more of it the better.

[Following is H. P. Blavatsky's editorial comment.]

We extract this letter from the pen of the Revd. Mr. Dall—the cousin of one of our good members at Simla, of the "Himalayan Theosophical Society"—for two reasons. First, to thank him for the fairness of opinion expressed; secondly,—to correct a few erroneous impressions he seems to be labouring under.

Yes; Theosophy *is* the science of all that is divine in man and nature. It is the study and the analysis, within the known and the knowable, of the unknown, and the otherwise UNKNOWABLE.

"In its practical application it certainly means—freedom (of thought), self-trust and self-control, courage and independence." And if all this, how can our Revd. well-wisher "fear its narrowness, as a plan of life"? Nor, is it easy to comprehend how can "Nirvana" which, in our benevolent critic's estimation, means "Lost in God," "Rest in God, rest in the Infinite," suggest to him at the same time, the picture of "association with Him and with kindred spirits . . . the fellowship with the Infinite and Eternal Worker, Thinker, Lover, Life-giver"? Could we, for one moment, anthropomorphize the Infinite; imagine a thinking brain in ABSOLUTE thought, etc., we would yet express our idea otherwise. We would not say "fellowship" and "association" (which words mean in every language mutual association or relationship *of persons* on equal terms); but rather assimilation or identity with, and absorption in, the ABSOLUTE. Where there is absolute and final blending and identity of a

part with the whole—there can be no *fellowship*. There is a vast difference between a separate drop of water thrown back or attracted into the ocean, and two drops of oil and water. The former is a drop "lost in," absorbed by and assimilated with the Parent Source; there results no "fellowship" or "association" but actual *identity* in this case. While the drop of oil and the drop of water are two distinct compounds, and though made to associate, in their finiteness, they can never be said to be *lost* in each other. Therefore, we must take exception to this definition of Nirvana, lowering both man and "God," by mutual dwarfing. If the definition of Nirvana is "lost in God"—and we accept it, only replacing the latter name by Parabrahm—the Universal Divine Essence—then Mr. Dall's further addition to programme of Nirvana, i.e., personal fellowship and association with "kindred spirits," is unphilosophical. It is indeed difficult to understand what he means when we find him saying, "I think Hinduism and Buddhism *err* in bidding me *lose myself* in God"; and then informing us in the same breath that the "patriarchal Debendronath Tagore" liked his, the Revd. Dall's definition, saying:—"Lost in God; you have it exactly."

Whatever may be the occult meaning of this evident contradiction, in everything else our critic comprehends Theosophy rightly in his letters. "Radical" Christianity is as welcome in its ranks as radical Buddhism, Judaism, or Hinduism. For, all religions divested of their man-made theologies and superlatively human ecclesiasticism rest on one and the same foundation, converge towards one focus: an ineradicable, congenital belief in an *inner* Nature reflected in the *inner* man, its microcosm; on this our earth, we can *know* of but one Light—the one *we see*. The Divine Principle, the WHOLE, can be manifested to our consciousness, but through Nature and its highest tabernacle—man, in the words of Jesus, the only "temple of God." Hence, the true theosophist, of whatever religion, rejecting acceptance of, and belief in, an extra-cosmic God, yet accepts this actual existence of a *Logos* whether in the Buddhist, Adwaitee, Christian Gnostic or Neo-Platonic esoteric sense, but will bow to no ecclesiastical, orthodox and dogmatic interpretation. Theosophy fights every anthropomorphic conception of the great UNKNOWABLE, and would impress upon the growing world, that its days of babyhood and even adolescence are over and gone by to return no more. Theosophy would teach its adherents that *animal* man, the finite, having been studied for ages and found wanting in everything

but animalism—he being the moral as well as physical synthesis of all the forms and beings through which he has evoluted, hence beyond correction and something that must be left to time and the work of evolution—it is more profitable to turn our attention to the spiritual or inner man, the infinite and the immortal. In its higher aspect, Theosophy pities and would help every living sentient creature, not man alone. He is a "good Theosophist," and so far as exotericism goes, a *grand* Theosophist who said, and says, to "all nations" and to "all religions," "I was hungry and you fed me, I was naked and you clothed me," meaning by "I," the human Logos—spiritual mankind collectively, the spiritual whole manifested in its parts and atoms or—if so preferred—"God manifested in Humanity." He is a better one who realizing deeply the profound esoteric meaning of this exoteric parable, *feeds and clothes all* nations and *all* religions unconditionally: one ever ready to trace back the personified pronoun "I" not to Jesus only, or even to any of the respective Christs and Gods manifested at different ages and to various nations, but to the universal *Logos* or divine Ego; one, in fine, who feeds the hungry and clothes the naked irrespective of their creed or nationality—as even the good king Asoka did.

A "personal God" says the *true* Theosophist, is the creation of the ephemeral and animal, though intellectual man. Therefore, the Rev. gentleman is wrong in querying whether David could be a Theosophist. A man who murders another to deprive him of his wife and thus satisfy his lust may be the "friend" of an anthropomorphic God; he cannot be a Theosophist. He is right, when asking whether Jesus was a Theosophist for "the Son of Man" and the "Man of Sorrow" was one in the full acceptation of the term, and this, perchance, is the very reason why so few have understood and appreciated him and why he was crucified. He was a lover of Truth Divine. No theosophist, whether Heathen or Christian, Jew or Gentile would ever think of rejecting the ideal Jesus, or refusing reverence to one who during life was one of the noblest and grandest of men, only to suffer the *post-mortem* degradation of being niched with the pettiest and smallest of gods in the world's pantheon of deities. The Theosophist only refuses to accept the Jesus Christ of the misinterpreted and grossly disfigured, ecclesiastical gospels. True to the colours of Universal Brotherhood, the Theosophist is always ready to accept undisguised truth; to bow before the man of whatever race or creed, who, *being but mortal* has struggled on-

ward, and achieving purification *through his own exertions,* risen to the eminence of the imaginary personal God. But he will ever refuse worship, or even recognition, to the virtue and righteousness of that extra cosmic deity. For if he is all that the Theist and Christian maintain him to be, he has no personal merit whatever. *If he is,* the "god" from, and in, eternity, the culmination of every perfection in heaven and on earth, perfection therefore is his inherent attribute; and what personal merit can there be in a Being that can neither be tempted nor commit sin? Instead of offering to such god worship, the true Theosophist, who rejects supernaturalism and miracle would feel inclined on the contrary, to take such a deity to task and ask him why—Essence of Bliss and Perfection as he is, he yet made man, "nominally" in his own image yet so helpless and so miserable, so sinful and so imperfect. As Buchanan says:—

"Almighty Fiend! who will judge *Thee* on *Thy* judgment day?"

This, of course, will be set down as "blasphemy." But it seems to us that there can be no more blasphemy in analyzing a personal God, which we maintain to be the creation of man's mind alone, than in dissecting morally and physically the creature of God—MAN, made by him in his own *physical* image for we trust that the likeness can apply still less to the *spiritual* "image" when one thinks of the average sinful man of this, our humanity?

Thus, a Theosophist will always respect and admire, if not follow a true "servant of Christ." And he will always openly despise a professing Christian, with not one of the Christ-like virtues; such, for instance as we find mirrored retrospectively in the great light thrown upon some *soi-disant* Christian teachers, by the recent trial of "Pigot vs. Hastie." Shall we, Theosophists, feel anything but scorn for the *Christians,* big and small fishes, who figured in this most disgraceful, legal tragi-comedy? Avaunt, *such* Christians. They may be fit for the front ranks of the pseudo-Christians but not, we hope, even for the background of the Theosophical Society.

letters • questions • comment

Is it correct to assume that all nations are now passing through Kali Yuga?

It might be well first to define the term Kali Yuga since it is from the Sanskrit and not widely understood. In the philosophy of Theosophy it is suggested that "the course of evolution is divided into four *Yugas* for every race in its own time and way." One of these is Kali Yuga. According to H. P. Blavatsky (*Glossary,* p. 170), it is "the black or iron age, our present period, the duration of which is 432,000 years." H.P.B. further states (*S.D.* I, 644-5):

> The Western Aryans had, every nation and tribe, like their Eastern brethren of the Fifth Race, their Golden and their Iron ages, their period of comparative irresponsibility, or the Satya age of purity, while now, several of them have reached their Iron Age, the *Kali Yuga,* an age BLACK WITH HORRORS.

The questioner asks whether all nations are now in this particular dark age, and the answer would seem to be, no, although isolation from the prevailing condition is increasingly difficult to maintain. The course of evolution differs for nations and races as it does for individuals. One has only to examine his own life to find that it is rare indeed to find any day composed wholly of one element, whether it is favorable or unfavorable. The mind can lift one from sorrow by recalling past pleasures or possible future joys, and likewise during those times when all goes well a man may note that the lives of others are not equally fortunate, and this may cause his contentment to be somewhat tempered. The opposites are always present.

Nations are made up of individuals, and while they may seem to be in a dark cycle at a given time, there are still evidences of the light to come. So, while in the larger sense this is the age of Kali Yuga, the darkness is not total. Mr. Judge makes this statement:

> At one and the same time races may be on the earth running each for itself through one or other of the periods. Some might be in the Golden Age and others in the Black. At present it is admitted that the Aryans are in the Kali Age, but certain child-

> like races are not so. . . . The overlapping of races as to their particular Yuga (or Age) can be easily seen in history. When the whites came to America the Indians were in their stone age in some places, using stone hammers, spears, knives, and arrows. Even in cultured South America the priests used stone knives for use at the sacrifices. We, however, had gone far beyond that. The red Indian of North America would have remained wholly in the stone age had we not altered it to some extent while we proceeded as instruments for his annihilation. Therefore in our own period we have examples of two races being in different Ages while living at the same time on the globe. (THEOSOPHY 2: 452-3.)

The man of the twentieth century may be surprised to hear that this is considered a dark age. This is a term once applied to that period of European history between the Graeco-Roman world and the flowering of the Renaissance. Yet modern writers have found much of value and interest in a study of medieval man. In fact Goldsmith wrote: "The most barbarous times had men of learning, if commentators, compilers, polemic divines, and intricate metaphysicians deserve the title." Achievements in both art and literature are to be noted during this period. Why then do we call this *Kali* Yuga? What constitutes the darkness of our time? Again referring to Mr. Judge:

> The characteristics of the present time show it clearly enough, for while physical civilization is high the spiritual side of it is low and dark, and selfishness is the prevailing order. (*Ibid.*, 454.)

Even when nations perform acts of generosity it is excused on the grounds of political expediency. All too often we do good, not to help those in need, but in order to make things more comfortable for ourselves and our way of life.

That the individual is not trapped or imprisoned even though he may be living during such a period is one of the hopeful aspects of this teaching. This is borne out by a concluding quotation from W.Q.J.:

> We can get great comfort from the theory given out at various times that in Kali Yuga a small effort goes farther for results than the same when made in a better Age. In the other Ages the rates of all things are slower than in this; hence, evil now seems quick; but in the same way good is also much quicker in effect and reach than in a slower time. (*Loc. cit.*)

STATEMENTS OF CONSEQUENCE

STRICTLY speaking, it is difficult to view the Jewish Book of Genesis otherwise than a chip from the trunk of the mundane tree of universal Cosmology, rendered in Oriental allegories. As cycle succeeded cycle, and one nation after another came upon the stage to play its brief part in the majestic drama of human life, each new people evolved from ancestral traditions its own religion, giving it a local color, and stamping it with its individual characteristics. While each of these new religions had its distinguishing traits, by which, were there no other archaic vestiges, the physical and psychological status of its creators could be estimated, all preserved a common likeness to one prototype. This parent cult was none other than the primitive "wisdom-religion." The Israelitish Scriptures are no exception.

Examination of the multitudinous religious faiths that mankind, early and late, have professed, most assuredly indicates that they have all been derived from one primitive source. It would seem as if they were all but different modes of expressing the yearning of the imprisoned human soul for intercourse with supernal spheres. As the white ray of light is decomposed by the prism into the various colors of the solar spectrum, so the beam of divine truth, in passing through the *three-sided* prism of man's nature, has been broken up into vari-colored fragments called RELIGIONS. And, as the rays of the spectrum, by imperceptible shadings, merge into each other, so the great theologies that have appeared at different degrees of divergence from the original source, have been connected by minor schisms, schools, and offshoots from the one side or the other. Combined, their aggregate represents one eternal truth; separate, they are but shades of human error and the signs of imperfection.

Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Chalcidius, Methodius, and Maimonides, on the authority of the *Targum* of Jerusalem, the orthodox and greatest authority of the Jews, held that the first two words in the book of Genesis—B-RASIT—mean *Wisdom*, or the *Principle*.

NOTE.—A student's collation from Theosophical works.

And the idea of these words meaning *"in the beginning"* was never shared but by the profane, who were not allowed to penetrate any deeper into the esoteric sense of the sentence.

Wisdom, the first emanation of En-Soph; the Protogonos, the Hypostasis; the Adam Kadmon of the kabalists, the Brahma of the Hindu; the Logos of Plato, and the "Beginning" of St. John—is the *Rasit* of the Book of Genesis. If rightly interpreted, it overturns the whole elaborate system of Christian theology, for it proves that behind the *creative* Deity, there was a HIGHER God; a planner, an architect; and that the former was but His executive agent—a simple POWER!

"All things," says the Kabala, "are derived from one great Principle, and this principle is the *unknown* and *invisible* God. From Him a substantial power immediately proceeds, which is the *image of God,* and the source of all subsequent emanations. This second principle sends forth, by the *energy* (or *will* and *force*) of emanation other natures, which are more or less perfect, according to their different degrees of distance, in the scale of emanation, from the First Source of existence, and which constitute different worlds, or orders of being, all united to the external power from which they proceed. Matter is nothing more than the most remote effects of the emanative energy of the Deity. The material world receives its form from the immediate agency of powers far beneath the First Source of Being.

Almost without exception, ancient and medieval scholars believed in the arcane doctrines of wisdom. The infinite and uncreated spirit that we usually call GOD, a substance of the highest virtue and excellency, produced everything else by *emanative causality.* Swayambhuva—the unknown essence of the Brahman—is identical with En-Soph, the unknown essence of the kabalists. In the ancient primitive trinity of India, that which may be certainly considered as pre-Vedic, the *germ* which fecundates the *mother-principle,* the mundane egg, or the universal womb, is called *Nara,* the Spirit, or the Holy Ghost, which emanates from the primordial essence. It is, like Sephira, the oldest emanation, called the *primordial point,* and the White Head, for it is the point of divine light appearing from within the fathomless and boundless darkness. In *Manu,* it is "NARA, or the Spirit of God, which moves on Ayana, (Chaos, or place of motion), and is called NARAYANA, or moving on the waters."

In Genesis we find: "And darkness was upon the face of the deep (chaos). And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." In the Kabala, the emanation of the primordial passive principle (Sephira), by dividing itself into two parts, active and passive, emits Chochma-Wisdom and Binah-Jehovah, and in conjunction with these two acolytes, which complete the trinity, becomes the Creator of the abstract Universe, the physical world being the production of later and still more material powers. In the Hindu Cosmogony, Swayambhuva emits Nara and Nari, its bisexual emanations, and dividing its parts into two halves, male and female, these fecundate the mundane egg, within which develops Brahma, or rather Viradj, the Creator.

The universal doctrine of emanations, adopted from time immemorial by the greatest schools which taught the kabalistic, Alexandrian, and Oriental philosophers, gives the key to the panic among Christian fathers. The spirit of Jesuitism and clerical craft, which prompted Parkhurst, many centuries later, to suppress in his Hebrew Lexicon the true meaning of the first word of Genesis, originated in those days of war against the expiring Neo-platonic and eclectic school. The fathers had decided to pervert the meaning of the word *"daimon,"* and they dreaded above all to have the esoteric and true meaning of the word *Rasit* unveiled to the multitudes; for if once the true sense of this sentence, as well as that of the Hebrew word *asdt* (translated in the Septuagint *"angels,"* while it means emanations), were understood rightly, the mystery of the Christian trinity would have crumbled, carrying in its downfall the new religion into the same heap of ruins with the ancient Mysteries.

The word *Rasit,* once taught in its new sense of the *Principle* and not the *Beginning,* and the anathematized doctrine of emanations accepted, the position of the second trinitarian personage becomes untenable. For, if the angels are the *first* divine emanations from the Divine Substance, and were in existence *before* the Second Principle, then the anthropomorphized *Son* is at best an emanation like themselves, and cannot be *God hypostatically* any more than our visible works are ourselves. That these metaphysical subtleties never entered into the head of the honest-minded, sincere Paul, is evident; as it is furthermore evident, that like all learned Jews he was well acquainted with the doctrine of emanations and never thought of corrupting it.

The endless emanations of the one First Cause, all of which were

gradually transformed by the popular fancy into distinct gods, spirits, angels, and demons, were so little considered immortal, that all were assigned a limited existence. And this belief, common to all the people of antiquity, to the Chaldean Magi as well as to the Egyptians, and even in our day held by the Brahmanists and Buddhists, most triumphantly evidences the monotheism of the ancient religious systems. This doctrine calls the life-period of all the inferior divinities, "one day of Parabrahma." Alone, the primal cause will exist forever, in all his glory, filling the infinite space. What better proof could be adduced of the deep reverential feeling with which the "heathen" regard the one Supreme eternal cause of all things visible and invisible.

For over fifteen centuries, thanks to the blindly brutal persecutions of those great vandals of early Christian history, Constantine and Justinian, ancient WISDOM slowly degenerated until it gradually sank into the deepest mire of monkish superstition and ignorance. In their insatiable desire to extend the dominion of blind faith, the early architects of Christian theology had been forced to conceal, as much as it was possible, the true sources of the same. To this end they are said to have burned or otherwise destroyed all the original manuscripts of the *Kabala,* magic, and occult sciences upon which they could lay their hands. They ignorantly supposed that the most dangerous writings of this class had perished with the last Gnostic; but some day they may discover their mistake. Other authentic and as important documents will perhaps reappear in a "most unexpected and almost miraculous manner."

With the last seven wise men of the Orient, the remnant group of the Neo-platonists, Hermias, Priscianus, Diogenes, Eulalius, Damaskius, Simplicius and Isidorus, who fled from the fanatical persecutions of Justinian to Persia, the reign of wisdom closed. The Pythagorean "knowledge of things as they are"; the profound erudition of the Gnostics; the world and time-honored teachings of the great philosophers; all were rejected as doctrines of Antichrist and Paganism, and committed to the flames. The books of Thoth (or Hermes Trismegistus), which contain within their sacred pages the spiritual and physical history of the creation and progress of our world, were left to mould in oblivion and contempt for ages. They found no interpreters in Christian Europe; the Philalethians, or wise "lovers of the truth," were no more; they were replaced by the light-fleers, the tonsured and hooded monks of Papal Rome, who dread

truth, in whatever shape and from whatever quarter it appears, if it but clashes in the least with their dogmas.

They persecuted the Gnostics, murdered the philosophers, and burned the kabalists and the masons; and when the day of the great reckoning arrives, and the light shines in darkness, what will they have to offer in the place of the departed, expiring religion? What will they answer, these pretended monotheists, these worshippers and *pseudo*-servants of the one living God, to their Creator? How will they account for this long persecution of them who were the true followers of the grand Megalistor, the supreme great master of the Rosicrucians, the FIRST of masons. "For he is the Builder and the Architect of the Temple of the universe; He is the *Verbum Sapienti.*"

Neither the great First Cause nor its emanation—human, immortal spirit—have left themselves "without a witness." Who knows but that as the Christian Church has unconsciously begotten free thought by reaction against her own cruelty, rapacity, and dogmatism, the public mind may be glad to follow the lead of the Orientalists, away from Jerusalem and towards Ellora; and that then much more will be discovered that is now hidden?

In the sublime and profoundest of all philosophies, that of the universal "Wisdom-Religion," the first traces of which, historical research finds in the old *pre*-Vedic religion of India . . . underlying every ancient popular religion the same ancient wisdom-doctrine, one and identical, professed and practiced by the initiates of every country, who alone were aware of its existence and importance.

"The THOUGHT concealed as yet the world in silence and darkness. . . . Then the Lord who exists through Himself, and *who is not to be divulged to the external senses of man;* dissipated darkness, and manifested the perceptible world.

"He that can be perceived only by the spirit, that escapes the organs of sense, who is without visible parts, eternal, the soul of all beings, that none can comprehend, displayed his own splendor" (*Manu*, i., slokas 6-7). Such is the ideal of the Supreme in the mind of every Hindu philosopher.

on the lookout

"Reincarnation"—Has its "Time" Come?

Victor Hugo is credited with the statement, "There is one thing stronger than all the armies in the world, and that is an idea whose time has come." Signs have become increasingly evident that such a time may be at hand for the doctrine of many lives, as reported in Lookout. An example of the interest among psychologists in this age-old teaching was the appearance in 1963 of *The Self in Transformation* by Herbert Fingarette (THEOSOPHY 51: 351). Dr. Fingarette devoted some seventy pages of this book to karma and reincarnation as applied to man's inner life. It is of special interest that the work is now available in paperback as a Harper Torchbook ("The Academy Library" series). Benjamin Nelson, editor of the series, describes its content:

> A perceptive student of psychoanalysis, Fingarette escapes the logical and spiritual blunders which have regrettably dogged orthodox Freudianism from the time the earthshaking insights of psychoanalysis were prematurely encased in rigid molds. Sensitive to the appeal of newer Continental outlooks, he has resisted espousing the crudities of myth, magic, and metaphor, which have marked America's importations of phenomenological psychology, *Daseinsanalyse,* existential analysis, onto-analysis, and so on. He draws heavily upon the resources of the East, without lapsing into the poses which are so often presented to us these days as the "Supreme Wisdom."
>
> It is above all notable that he begins with the insight, so stubbornly resisted by the great mass of "brass instruments" psychologists, that the "stages on life's way" (in Kierkegaard's memorable words) require to be understood and lived from our vital centers. This example of Fingarette's should persuade us to "get moving" and *keep* moving. The roads we must traverse know no end.

"Karma and Marriage"

At a popular level, Dr. David Goodman discusses this subject in his syndicated column "Family Counsel" (*Hudson Dispatch,* April 14). Dr. Goodman quotes Chauncey M. Depew as having

said, "I don't know whether there is any such thing as reincarnation, but if there is, I hope to be reincarnated as Mrs. Depew's husband again," and comments:

> What a gallant remark! How about you? Would you like to meet and marry your present spouse in another reincarnation? No doubt many a husband, many a wife would shudder at the thought. . . . "If I'm ever reincarnated, I hope to get a better marriage than that."
>
> The Hindu doctrine of karma—one of the most universally accepted of philosophic concepts—declares that man himself, either in his present, or some future existence (reincarnation) enjoys the fruit of, or has to atone for, his former good and bad actions. This is a tougher philosophy than the Judeo-Christian belief in the remission of sin by divine grace or vicarious substitution. You have to earn your own salvation, your own spiritual growth. The way to have a better fate in some future existence on earth (reincarnation) is to do better with your present life—free it of its errors, enrich it by wise and good deeds.
>
> If this idea were applied to marriage, which one of us would deserve a better marriage next time around because of the merit we had earned in the marriage we have now? . . . Bliss—married bliss—doesn't come of its own accord. You have to earn it by your own endeavours. Sturdy personalities like it that way. They enjoy making their own success, their own happiness, in marriage as in everything else. For them life is growth, and growth is their greatest satisfaction.

Ecology—Indian Style

An article by D. G. Poole in the March issue of *Sanity* (Montreal, Canada) titled "Integration—Which Way?" reports statements by several articulate Canadian Indians on Canada's Indian and Eskimo "problem." (*Sanity* is a peace-oriented newspaper with aims allied to those of the War Resisters League.) The Indian spokesmen note that integration in Canada is "a one-way street," amounting to a complete restructuring of the Indian ethos—institutional, educational, vocational; and they are asking themselves: "Is it worth it? What are we being offered in exchange?"

Miss Analis Obomaswin, an Abenaki whom *MacLean's* named "one of the outstanding Canadians of 1965," contrasted the Indian's and the White man's attitude toward his environment. In part, she said:

> Indians were never in business. But they were sensitive traders. They traded with each other and they traded with environment . . . with the sun and the sky, with the earth and the sea and the

> forest. For everything they took they gave back something of themselves in energy, in prayer, in gratitude. After a thousand —ten thousand—generations of living in this way the streams ran clear, the air sparkled clean as ever, the fish, the animals, the wild fruits of the earth sustained us still. Your people also trade with environment. But it is a one-way exchange. Canada, the most affluent of countries, operates on a depletion economy which leaves destruction in its wake. . . . When the last tree is cut, the last fish caught and the last river polluted; when to breathe the air is sickening, you will realize, too late, that wealth is not in bank accounts and that you can't eat money. . . .

Ecology—U.S.A.

Among conservationists, says Mr. Poole, there are a very few who "suspect that the last hope of Western civilization may lie in the inclination of its members to understand, accept and live by the ecological values inherent in the Indian way of life." But the white man is not likely to approach the ecological problem from this direction, for, as one Canadian Indian put it, the white man attacks his problems rationally, while the Indian solves his by singing and dancing.

Western civilization's way of trying to counteract the rape of natural resources is described in some detail by Leland J. Haworth, director of the National Science Foundation, in his article "By Studying Nature Whole" (*Saturday Review,* May 7). "If man is to endure on earth," says Mr. Haworth, "he must one day achieve a more rational kind of steady state in which pollution is matched by purification, and consumption of resources is matched by replenishment of resources." He then describes several research projects in different areas of natural science—projects that will suggest better ways of dealing with our environment. NSF aids these researches both by helping provide personnel and assisting with funds. As a result of these efforts—

> The important problems of our environment and its effects on animal, plant, and human life are being brought to people at every level. Popular support is thus generated for creative technology and applied research to attack the visible problems man has created for himself in modifying his environment in the name of progress. . . . And just as we do not know which items of fundamental research will provide the keys to unlock the future, neither do we know whether any particular key will be turned by the physicist, the biologist, the chemist, the social scientist, or the engineer.

What is "Progress"?

Because many of our best thinkers are asking this question, it seems pertinent to cite from Mr. Poole's article what a young Toronto Indian had to say on the subject:

> One of the supposed marks of our original savagery is that we had not discovered the wheel. Yet I have heard it said by Indians that it is possible we discovered the wheel and rejected it. They say that had the wheel come into popular use, we would have had to build roads. As it was, the continent was laced with a network of waterways and for travel on these, the Indian devised the canoe. No better inland boat has ever been designed. . . .
>
> There is a lesson in the wheel. It is this. For every gain in comfort, in convenience, in ease . . . there is a price. Even the first maker of fire paid for his little personal sun. He exchanged a measure of his fortitude for warmth. I don't mean to say it was not a good exchange. He was better off. So was the inventor of the wheel. But what can be said of the inventor of the guided missile or even of television? Is there not a point in what your people call progress, where a man should stop and take his own measure? Should he not know when he is becoming less a self-sufficient man and more a slave to his own inventions? What do we become when we abandon what we are for what we hope to get? This is the question we ask ourselves when we are told by the Whites that the best thing for us is Integration.

"The Third Culture"

Something of the same basic concern underlies Norman Cousins' editorial, also in the May 7 issue of *SR* (the tenth anniversary issue of its Science & Humanities Supplement). Mr. Cousins recalls one of the primary reasons for initiating the Science and Humanities departments: to provide a forum where members of C. P. Snow's "Two Cultures"—Science and the Liberal Arts—might have an opportunity to develop a common language for the flow of ideas from one branch of learning to the other—and thence to the general public. Then Cousins makes this critical assessment:

> The main problem of the two cultures is not now, nor has it been for some time, the absence of communication between scientist and non-scientist. The problem has to do with what is being communicated. The scholars or artists and the scientists are talking to each other but not about the right things. Here we come to the real failure of the two cultures. Creative brainpower and advanced skills are not being directed to the largest need of the human species. The common and tragic failure of both the arts and the sciences is that they have given most of their energy and focus to the immediates and intermediates and very little to

the ultimates. They have advanced the human condition without necessarily safeguarding the human estate. . . .

The reach of science and engineering has superseded the capacity for social and political organization. The betterment of human society depends even more on the conditions of an enforceable peace than on an ingenious technology.

The need today is for a Third Culture—one concerned with the total effect, one which recognizes that human destiny cannot be served or assured until tribalism, however elevated its station or sophisticated its language, gives way to a world view.

H. P. Blavatsky's "Civilization, the Death of Art and Beauty" (reprinted in the pamphlet, *Moral and Social Issues*), relates to some of the content of such discussions. Today, more and more people seem to be asking themselves What *is* Civilization? What is "Progress"? What, indeed, is MAN?

The Case for Conscientious Objectors

Under this title, Ronald Goldfarb reviewed for the June American Bar Association *Journal* the cases of three young men who claimed exemption from the draft on the ground that they were conscientious objectors. "The cases," says Mr. Goldfarb, "presented questions of a man's personal belief as contrasted with adherence to an organized religious philosophy or group." All three of the young men involved had been convicted of refusing to submit to induction. Two convictions were reversed and the Government appealed; one conviction was upheld, and the defendent appealed. The three cases were consolidated, and the Supreme Court was unanimous in affirming the reversal in the first two cases and reversing the conviction in the other case. Mr. Goldfarb comments:

The majority opinion suggested that the long Congressional history of conscientious objector legislation has recognized consistently that one might be religious without belonging to an organized church. Applying this rationale to the present cases, Justice Clark held that it is one's individual belief rather than membership in a particular recognized church or sect that determines the duties God imposes upon man and the religiosity of one's compulsions. The test is, he held, whether one's belief is "sincere and meaningful and occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God of one who clearly qualifies for the exemption."

Mr. Goldfarb observes: "Critics who might have said that God was repulsed again by the Court, since it gave recognition to people who do not believe in God through some organized religious

commitment, would have been quite wrong; He really was given a much broader recognition."

Levels of Conscience

Thus the Supreme Court decision puts on the draft board the burden of deciding whether a draftee is a truly *conscientious* objector by reason of distinctively personal conviction. The dilemma shows up most clearly in the military setting, as when a soldier, on purely humanistic grounds, refuses to kill his "enemies." Such a case made news when the court-martial of Adam Weber in Vietnam was reported (Los Angeles *Times,* June 19). Although a Catholic, Pvt. Weber based his objections on a "personal humanist position," and was thereupon sentenced to hard labor for one year. The *Times* writer comments:

> Weber's moral imperative, more than any other, is that which poses the gravest difficulty for a combat commander. It lies at the root of most religions. It underlies most laws of civilized nations. It threatens the military system. It questions the purpose of an army or a cause. Even military men who respect it as a principle fear it as a potential and virtually undefensible cloak for escape from the fears which men face in battle. When it appears in service, in the military view, it must be handled quickly, disposed of, lest it spread from those who espouse it as a principle to those who would merely use it as a cloak.

All four of these young men had backgrounds of philosophical study and reflection, and had arrived at personal convictions regarding the nature of Deity, of man, and of the universe. Each had "an inspiration of his own to solve the universal problems"; and each was willing to assume responsibility for his decision.

The Moral Imperative

David Lawrence, in his editorial "A Plea for Unity" (*U.S. News and World Report,* May 9) notes that "religious wars are recurrent" and that "they exemplify the failure of mankind to resolve all major disputes by the processes of reason instead of violence." He goes on to say, in part:

> What is needed today is a change of emphasis. We must forego our tendency to concentrate on differences and center our attention on the similarities in religious thought. For only in the realm of the spiritual will we find the inspiration which may show us how to mobilize the peace sentiment of the world.
>
> We can start with *The Essential Unity of all Religions,* which happens to be the title of a remarkable book of compilations

of ancient religions. . . . The author [Bhagavan Das] wrote:

"Some learned scholars essay to prove that the religions of later birth have copied from the earlier. The question, whether it is so, may have an intellectual historical interest for the learned few. A far deeper, more vital, more human interest is possessed, and for all mankind, by the question, why they have done so, if they have copied from one another at all. Is it not because there is only One Eternal Truth for all to copy?

"New generations are born from old, new nations grow out of colonies from old, new lamps are lighted from old, but the Life, the Light, the Might, which is only embodied in and expressed by the ever-changing forms, is beyond them all."

• Moral force, derived from a recognition of the essential unity of all religions, can prove even more powerful than military might in persuading governments everywhere that "thou shalt not kill" is an eternal mandate. But the impulse to destroy human life can never be conquered without submitting ourselves in every dispute to the guidance of a certain Something revealed to us in all the religions of mankind.

All this may be easily supported. Yet it is only as individuals recognize and feel deeply the essential unity of all mankind as a FACT IN NATURE that "Brotherhood *in actu*" will become an impelling basis for peace.

New Emphasis in FDA

In a speech before the annual meeting of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association (April 6), James L. Goddard, new Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, carried his indictment of the industry's laxity in research, unprofessional reports of "so-called studies," and deliberate misrepresentation in advertising, directly to PMA members. An editorial comment (in *Science* for April 15) notes that Mr. Goddard has already apprised Congress, the press, industry representatives, and agency personnel that under his direction "consumer-oriented firmness is to replace industry-oriented flexibility in dealing with complicated drug questions." At the end of all the panoply of preparing a new drug and marketing it, he reminds PMA, "you reach the physician who will administer your product to a human being." He continues:

At the end of the long line is a human life. Some of you seem to have forgotten this basic fact. . . . Therefore, I am bringing to your attention some things that you must be made aware of, for only you know how to correct them.

I have been shocked at the materials that come in to us. I have been shocked at the clear attempts to slip something by us. I am

> deeply disturbed at the constant, direct, personal pressure some industry representatives have placed upon our people.

After enumerating several instances of professional and moral laxity, Commissioner Goddard concludes:

> I began my remarks by saying I was uneasy about the future of the pharmaceutical industry. The examples I have given . . . are all symptoms of a disease that drugs cannot cure—but which can undermine the industry as we know it.
>
> That disease is irresponsibility.
>
> You cannot afford to have it in your midst any longer. . . . Because human lives are at stake.

Bearing of Language on Origin of "Man"

"The answer to the ancient question 'What is man?' must be based first on man's biological character," says George Gaylord Simpson of Harvard University, in his article "The Biological Nature of Man" (*Science,* April 22). Prof. Simpson amasses much "evidence" to support the theory that "man is the product of evolution from primeval apes"—evidence composed of what he considers "irrefutable observations." Yet in the section, "Attempts to Trace Language," Prof. Simpson weakens his argument by seeming to suggest the theosophical teaching that Man represents a *descent* of Mind-beings into animal forms. He says:

> At the present time no languages are primitive in the sense of being significantly close to the origin of language. Even the peoples with the least complex cultures have highly sophisticated languages, with complex grammar and large vocabularies, capable of naming and discussing anything that occurs in the sphere occupied by their speakers—the oldest language that can reasonably be reconstructed is already modern, sophisticated, complete from an evolutionary point of view.

How could it be else, if, as H.P.B. observes: "Intellect has an enormous development in this [Fourth] Round. The (hitherto) dumb races acquire our (present) human speech on this globe, on which, from the Fourth Race, language is perfected and knowledge increases." She also says: "The man who preceded the Fourth, the Atlantean race, however much he may have looked physically like a 'gigantic ape' . . . was still a thinking and already a speaking man." (*S.D.* I, 189, 191.)